TAXON

OFFICIAL NEWS BULLETIN OF THE

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PLANT TAXONOMY

VOLUME V

1956

UTRECHT—NETHERLANDS

Edited and published for the I.A.P.T. by the
International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/taxon_1956-02_5_1

FEBRUARY 1956
VOL. V No 1

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

THE SECOND UTRECHT CONFERENCE ON BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

by

Reed C. Rollins (Cambridge, Mass.)

Precision of statement, so that misinterpretation is reduced to a minimum, is of particular importance in any code and no less so in our International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. The difficulties of providing accuracy and at the same time giving the basis for exact interpretation in several different languages are greater than are readily realized. The present editorial committee is acutely aware of these requirements, as other committees have been in the past. For this reason, over the years there have been a number of conferences devoted to the problem of putting the legislated actions of successive International Botanical Congresses into precise language.

After a careful study of two different drafts of the new Code, prepared by Dr. Stafleu, Secretary of the Committee, in which he first incorporated the items passed by the Eighth International Botanical Congress, it was time to meet in conference to iron out the minor differences of opinion among members and to obtain final and concerted editorial action on the Code as a whole. Professor Lanjouw, Chairman, called the meeting to convene in Utrecht, November 13—18, to coincide with a previously arranged trip to Europe by Dr. Jacques Rousseau, thus assuring his presence at the conference. Dr. A. C. Smith and I were enabled to attend because of a grant for travel expenses made by the Rockefeller Foundation for that specific purpose.

By Sunday afternoon, November 13, the full committee consisting of Dr. Charles Baehni (Geneva), Dr. J. Lanjouw (Utrecht), Dr. W. Robyns (Brussels), Dr. R. Ross (London), Dr. J. Rousseau (Montreal), Dr. G. M. Schulze (Berlin), Dr. A. C. Smith (Washington), Dr. R. de Vilmorin (Paris), and Dr. F. A. Stafleu (Utrecht) had assembled at the home of Professor V. J. Koningsberger, where we were delightfully received for tea by our Dutch hosts. The following morning we were hard at work in a nicely appointed room in the University Building at the Domplein. From then on, a vigorous schedule of morning and afternoon sessions was maintained throughout the week, except for a single afternoon when the entire group travelled to Leiden to lunch and dine with an impressive group of Dutch botanists assembled for the occasion.

The efficient organizational skill we associate with the activities of Professor Lanjouw and Dr. Stafleu became evident immediately on our arrival in Utrecht. At our hotels, envelopes were handed to us when we arrived, containing the names and local addresses of all conference members, a complete schedule of the week's activities, train and bus tickets with notations as to their use between specific points,

The Editorial Committee together with a group of Dutch taxonomists at Noordwijk (Netherl.).
Left to right: R. C. Rollins, S. Bloembergen, A. J. M. Leeuwenberg, A. L. Stoffers, W. Robyns, P. van Royen, K. U. Kramer, H. J. Lam, S. J. van Ooststroom, E. A. Mennega, F. A. Stafleu, R. de Vilmorin, A. M. W. Mennega, A. C. Smith, P. A. Florschuetz, J. Lanjouw, J. Th. Koster, J. Rousseau, A. C. de Roon, L. van der Pijl, R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink, C. G. G. J. van Steenis, G. M. Schulze, J. C. Lindeman, T. J. Reichgelt, J. H. Kern, R. Ross, H. Sleumer, P. Leenhouts, J. J. Swart.

and the locations of places we needed to know about. From the beginning, the work of the conference moved ahead smoothly and with dispatch, although there were times when some anxiety was felt over the possibility of not finishing on time. However, by Friday evening, there was a general feeling of satisfaction on the part of committee members and it was possible to say that the business at hand had been fairly transacted. We were fortunate to have been working under Dr. Lanjouw as presiding officer, for he kept the work moving along efficiently.

There were a number of high points during our stay in Holland, although we were made to feel most welcome at all times. Late Monday afternoon, we were received by the President, Dr. M. L. van Holthe tot Echten, and other officials of the Board of Governors of Utrecht University, as well as by the Rector, Prof. C. P. Raven. The occasion permitted exchanges of friendliness and we were amply assurred of the sincerity of the host University in its invitation to us to convene within its walls. It was a real pleasure for our committee to be thus received and for us to have an opportunity to visit briefly with officials, botanists, and students in botany of Utrecht University. One evening our group went by train to Amsterdam, where we dined at the early seventeenth century tavern "De Silveren Spiegel". There in the Burgomaster's room, surrounded with the atmosphere of an old Amsterdam house, we partook of a very fine meal and enjoyed the fellowship that such an occasion inevitably brings forth.

Another highlight of the week was a trip to Leiden. This had been carefully planned so that the arrival of botanists from different parts of Holland coincided

with our arrival. After lunch, the group, having increased to thirty botanists, was captained by Professor Lam on a tram trip to the shore of the North Sea. There we strolled along the beach for some distance, exchanging views and becoming better acquainted as we walked. Returning to Leiden in the late afternoon, we reassembled in the historical "Academy" of the University, where we were received by Professor van Arkel, Rector Magnificus, and other officials of the Board of Governors of Leiden University. Our reception in Leiden was extended at a dinner in the rooms of the University, given in honor of our Editorial Committee by Dutch colleagues of both Utrecht and Leiden. Our fine companions of the afternoon proved to be equally generous and friendly in the evening. Professor Lam, as the spokesman for our hosts, deftly changed from one language to another, interjecting humor at appropriate points, and withall making it plain that the occasion had some historical significance not quickly appreciated by many of us, for it was the first time in some years that Utrecht and Leiden botanists had met together in a completely friendly atmosphere. Truly, it was a memorable afternoon and evening for all privileged to be there and we were sorry to have it come to an end.

When the new Code is published, one of the first items to attract the reader's attention will be the reorganization of the first part into a preamble. Such general statements of purposes and objectives as occur there are indeed more appropriately treated as a preamble than as articles of the Code. Other editorial changes were aimed at clarification of the language or of presentation, without alteration of the

The Editorial Committee on the Utrecht 'Domplein'.

Left to right: G. M. Schulze, R. Ross, J. Rousseau, W. Robyns, Ch. Baehni, A. C. Smith, J. Lanjouw, R. de Vilmorin, and F. A. Stafleu. Photo taken by R. C. Rollins.

meaning, which, of course, the Committee had no authority to do. As a coöpted member of the Committee somewhat in the role of an outsider, I can state that a genuine desire to do the best possible editorial job for the benefit of our subject pervaded the deliberations. Each committeeman was prepared to examine the viewpoint of another and the final product is, truly, the result of real international cooperation. It is not my purpose to indicate in detail what the new Code will be like, for readers will be able to see it for themselves in a few months.

English, French and German are the official languages of the Code, with English being the language of reference, and the English version being the one from which the French and German are to be taken. The French version is being prepared by a subcommittee of the Editorial Committee, consisting of Dr. Rousseau, Chairman, Dr. Baehni, Dr. Robyns, and Dr. de Vilmorin. The German version is being prepared by Dr. Schulze. The Code will appear in book form and will include all three language versions.

Even though I have no authority to speak for the Committee as a whole, I know members would agree that our Dutch hosts provided both an ideal atmosphere for the work of the conference and a most enjoyable schedule of extra curricular activities for those participating in it. Although 'the proof of the pudding is in the eating' and the ultimate judgement on the degree of success attained by this Editorial Committee will be made by botanists who use the Code, I venture to predict that they will like the results and will agree that the Committee has discharged its duties in a most effective manner.

NOMINA NUDA ARE NOT ILLEGITIMATE!

by

H. C. D. de Wit (Wageningen)

Art. 22 of the Code rules that nomina nuda have "no status" and "no claim to recognition by botanists". The term "nomina nuda" is not used — the Code contains no definition of nomina nuda — but, clearly, nomina nuda are not validly published (Art. 42, first paragraph, sub (2)).

Nevertheless, though not recognized, nomina nuda make their presence, time and again, painfully felt. Often I have participated in discussions that ensued from the presence of nomina nuda, particularly in suspected homonymy of specific names.

These discussions were brought about by a careful consideration of the Code and not infrequently it was decided to adopt a solution which seemed logical even if some uncertainty remained whether we had really adhered to the Code or not. I wish to survey some points illustrating the line of reasoning sometimes followed. It will be proposed that some small amendments to the Code might lead to greater clarity and the avoidance of mistakes. I claim that adoption of these proposals would also contribute to stabilization of specific names.

Rec. 54 D. "Authors should avoid adoption of a name or an epithet which has been previously published as a nomen nudum."

This implies that a nomen nudum does not render illegitimate a later homonym. If it did, this Recommendation would be superfluous and irrelevant. On this ground botanists decide that a specific name homonymous with an earlier nomen nudum, though undesirable, if they wish so, may stand.

Art. 73, second paragraph. "The publication of an epithet in an illegitimate combination must not be taken into consideration for purposes of priority (see Art. 53) except in the rejection of a later homonym (Art. 74).

It may be gathered from the final phrase of this paragraph that an illegitimate

combination leads to the rejection of a later homonym. An illegitimate name (or combination) is one that is contrary to the rules (Art. 10). A nomen nudum is contrary to Arts 42 and 52. And so it is believed that a nomen nudum is an illegitimate name and, according to Art. 73, it might cause the rejection of a later homonym. A specific name is rejected on account of the existence of an earlier nomen nudum.

The reality of this view is demonstrated by the case of *Pseudotsuga taxifolia* (Poir.) Britton. This name was replaced by *P. menziesii* (Mirb.) Franco, which led to fervent reactions, even to an official resolution of the Society of American Foresters. However, Boivin demonstrated recently (Bolet. Socied. Broter. 28: 63—64, 1954) that this name change rests on a supposed illegitimacy of the name *Pseudotsuga taxifolia*. There exist earlier names but these are, in reality, nomina nuda. There appears to be no need at all to change the name *Pseudotsuga taxifolia*.

The error in procedure is caused by a misunderstanding of the term "illegitimate". Art. 73, when referring to "illegitimate combinations" does *not* include nomina nuda. According to Art. 22 "A name of a taxon has no status under this Code, and no claim to recognition by botanists unless it is validly published", nomina nuda are without status and are not recognized: they are *not illegitimate*, have no claim to the status of illegitimacy: they are entirely to be ignored. A later homonym of a nomen nudum, therefore, is allowed, though better avoided (Rec. 54 D).

Art. 53, second paragraph: "For purposes of priority, however, only legitimate names and epithets published in legitimate combinations are taken into consideration (see Arts 10, 73 and the exception to this rule mentioned in Art. 74). Now in Art. 74 it is stated: (2nd sentence) "Even if the earlier homonym is illegitimate .... the later homonym must be rejected."

In the same way as before, botanists when believing that a nomen specificum nudum is illegitimate, are inclined to reject later homonyms, which results in name changes. It has been demonstrated that the application of Art. 22 prevents rejection for such reasons.

As regards Art. 81, 3rd sentence, it should be stressed that a nomen nudum can never be regarded as an illegitimate combination.

Art. 81, third sentence. "When a new epithet is required, an author may, if he wishes, adopt an epithet previously given to the taxon in an illegitimate combination, if there is no obstacle to its employment in the new position or sense; the epithet in the resultant combination is treated as new."

The first half of this sentence is phrased in a manner strongly reminiscent of Rec. 54 D. It opens a possibility of using an epithet derived from an illegitimate combination, if the author wishes. Rec. 54 D also opens the possibility of using the epithet derived from a nomen nudum, if the author wishes. This analogy probably added to lead botanists up the garden path.

Summarizing the position I find that Rec. 54 D, Art. 22, and Art. 81, if remembered together, may suggest that a specific name can stand or be coined in spite of earlier nomina nuda. On the other hand Arts. 53, 73, and 74 suggest to botanists who fail to realize that Art. 22 actually rules out all nomina nuda once and forever, that homonymous or synonymous specific names must fall if earlier nomina nuda exist. Although a strict application of the Code solves these difficulties, in practice it appears that the Code is not "sufficiently clear", as it should be (Art. 4).

This state of affairs seems unsatisfactory to me. It causes and has caused, confusion. There is a simple means to put a first step towards more clarity. Art. 22 contains a reference to Art. 42. If Art. 42 contained a back reference to Art. 22 this would stress the nomenclatural non-existence of nomina nuda. There is, however, another problem connected with the insertion of this most desirable reference or indication.

Nowhere in the Code any definition is given of a nomen specificum nudum, though there are thousands of them to be found in effectively published botanical literature. What is a nomen nudum? A binomial without any accompanying text evidently is a nomen nudum. Every taxonomist is also well acquainted with binomials adorned by texts like: "a tree in the mountains", "used for house-building", "abundant in the forests", or by one or more vernacular names as equivalents. These are the so-called "nomina semi-nuda", which are essentially just as naked and useless for taxonomical and nomenclatural purposes as any undiluted nomen nudum.

Nomina nuda and nomina semi-nuda, I hold, could be regarded as of one kind, according to their nature. They are all "nomina nuda".

It is very difficult to draft a delimitation of what are nomina nuda (in the wider sense) and what are binomials valid under the Code.

One might suggest that a valid binomial should be at least accompanied by words of diagnostical value, characterizing or describing the taxon in some way intended to make it recognizable to others. Evidently, this is what we want and should decide whether a binomial is a nomen nudum or not.

A binomial, for example *Lamium album*, without any accompanying description is already diagnostical. Should this binomial have been published without any accompanying text, it would be considered to be a nomen nudum and accordingly be rejected and not recognized. If the same taxon were later introduced into effectively published literature as "Lamium ruderale, a plant with opposite leaves and a white, sympetalous two-lipped corolla" it would certainly stand a good chance of being accepted under the name Lamium ruderale, although the diagnostical value of both publications is exactly the same.

I think it best not to try for a delimitation of nomina nuda in a wider sense. If a name is published without any accompanying text, although it may be of diagnostical value by itself, there is no problem (Art. 22). If it is published with an accompanying text without any diagnostical value, it should be treated similarly and not be regarded as validly published. It is a nomen nudum as well. In cases where there is doubt if the text to the name is of diagnostical value, a policy might be adopted comparable to that of the type method (designation of types).

Art. 22 is basal for this problem. Nomina specifica nuda (and specifica semi-nuda) should have no status and receive no recognition in nomenclature. They do not and should not cause the rejection of later specific names, which are otherwise valid. Recommendation 54 D, of course, should stand.

I think that botanists have a right that their legislature give unambiguous guidance in this matter and propose therefore the following alterations to the Code.

To be *added* to Art. 42 *):

Note. A nomen specificum nudum is a binomial occurring in effectively published literature without any accompanying text or accompanied by words considered to be without diagnostical value. Nomina specifica nuda are not recognized by the Code (see Art. 22). —

New Recommendation (to follow Art. 42) **):

Once a binomial is designated by name as a nomen specificum nudum in effectively published literature the decision ought to be followed unless an error in judgment can be proved. —

I believe that these proposals, if adopted, will add to a better understanding of the Code as regards nomina specifica nuda (and nomina specifica semi-nuda), also, and this is perhaps more important, that monographers and revisers of taxa are

*) Proposal no 2 submitted to the 9th International Botanical Congress, Montreal 1959.
**) Proposal no 3 idem.

provided with a new weapon by which nomina specifica semi-nuda, threatening to uproot established usage of a specific name, can often be reduced to harmlessness. Adoption will add to the stabilization of specific names.

Finally, I wish to thank Dr. Stafleu for his kind help and advice for the composition of this paper.

THE INDO-PACIFIC STRAND SCAEVOLA

by

F. R. Fosberg (Falls Church, Va.) and M. H. Sachet (Washington, D.C.)

The common beach species of *Scaevola* of the Indo-Pacific region was, during the 19th and early 20th centuries, generally called either *Scaevola koenigii* Vahl or *S. lobelia* Murr. Some confusion existed between it and the Atlantic species, *S. plumierii* L., but the two were generally separated.

When Krause, in 1912, wrote his monograph of the Goodeniaceae (Pflr. IV, 277) he adopted the name *Scaevola frutescens* (Mill.) Krause for this species without any comment whatever. Since that time this name has been almost universally applied to the species, though Merrill (Phil. Jour. Sci. Bot. 7: 353, 1912) and Degener and Greenwell (Fl. Haw. 340, Scaevola frutescens, 12/1/1949) have pointed out that this application is at least dubious. They continued, however, to use *S. frutescens*.

Scaevola frutescens is based on *Lobelia frutescens* Mill. Gard. Dict. ed. 8, 1768. Miller's treatment of this species includes references to Linnaeus' *Flora Zeylanica* and Plumier's *Nova plantarum americanarum genera* followed by a rather full description which he states was based on plants from seeds sent from the Bahamas by Catesby and from Vera Cruz by Houstoun. There is no mention, whatever, of an Old World plant excepting the Flora Zeylanica reference, which applies principally to the Indo-Pacific but also includes two references to the American one (see synonymy below).

In 1950, while at the British Museum herbarium I took opportunity to examine Miller's actual specimen, which Dr. G. H. M. Lawrence, at that time engaged in photographing the Miller specimens, assured me had been before Miller when he wrote his description. This specimen is without doubt the plant found in the Caribbean region, *Scaevola plumierii* L., and it bears the annotation "Houstoun".

Krause, as Merrill (1912) has pointed out, undoubtedly based his decision on the then current practice of typifying an early species by the first reference or specimen cited, which, in this case, was the Flora Zeylanica reference. This procedure was of extremely doubtful validity under the Vienna Rules, then in force, and under the present regulations for determination of types has no standing at all. If the specimens can be found on which the author of a species based his original description the type must be selected from them. In this case there is apparently only one such specimen, that in the British Museum (for photograph see negative no. 05266, Bailey Hortorium), so this must be regarded as the holotype. References to earlier literature must be taken into account only if the author's concept of the species was based entirely or principally on them. Hence, in spite of Merrill's and Degener's decisions to follow Krause, it becomes necessary to relegate the now widely known name *Scaevola frutescens* to synonymy under *S. plumierii* L. It would be very convenient to be able to go back to the well-known usage of *Scaevola koenigii* Vahl for the Indo-Pacific species, but, as the following synonymy shows, this is not possible under a careful application of the International Code. Arranged chronologically the essential synonymy of this species is as follows. Some names applied

subsequently are added but this list is not exhaustive except as to such names as have a bearing on the choice of the correct designation under the Code. A number of other names by de Vriese, Hance, and Stocks were published by Walpers in volumes 2 and 6 of his Repertorium and volume 2 of his Annales, some of which may belong here. However, a critical study is needed before they are disposed of finally. One or two also were included by de Candolle in the Prodromus.

Bela-modagam Rheede, Hort. Malab. 4: 131, 5. 59, 1673 [1683].
Takkada. Arbor exitiosa marina .... Hermann, Museum Zeylanicum, ed. 2, 45, 1726.
Arbor exitiosa, marina, lactescens, ... Burmann, Thes. Zeyl. 29—30, 1737 (includes various synonyms which we have not needed to verify for our purposes).
Buglossum litoreum. Moral. Rumph, Herb. Amb. 4: 116, t. 54, 1743.
Lobelia frutescens, foliis ovali-oblongis integerrimis.
"*Lobelia frutescens, portulacae folio. Plum. gen. 21. Catesb. ornith. 1. p. 79. t. 79.*"
"*Descr. Arbuscula ramis teretibus, crassis. Folia obverse ovata, in petiolos definentia, integerrima, obtusa, glabra, carnosa; ex alis pedunculi aliquot floribus. Inter pictas zeylanicas Hermanii.*" Linn. Fl. Zeyl. 148, 1747 (*pro parte*) (this is quoted in full because of its bearing on the application of later names).
Lobelia plumierii L. Sp. Pl. 929, 1753 (*pro parte*).
Scaevola lobelia Murr. Syst. veg. ed. 13, 178, 1774 (*pro parte, nom. illegit.*)
Scaevola sericea Forst. f. Prodr. 89, 1786 (*nomen nudum*).
Lobelia taccada Gaertn. Fruct. Sem. Pl. 1: 119, t. 25, f. 5, 1788.
Scaevola sericea Vahl, Symb. Bot. 2: 37, 1791.
Scaevola koenigii Vahl, Symb. Bot. 3: 36, 1794.
Scaevola taccada Roxb., Hort. Beng. 15, 1814.
Scaevola bela-modagam Rheede ex Roem. & Sch. Syst. 5: 163, 1819.
Scaevola taccada (Gaertn.) Roxb., Fl. Ind. 1: 527, 1820 (*nom. illegit.*)
Scaevola velutina Presl, Rel. Haenk. 2: 58, 1831.
Scaevola plumerioides Nutt., Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. II, 8: 252, 1843.
Scaevola koenigii var. *glabra* Matsumura, Bot. Mag. (Tokyo) 14: 57, 1900.
Scaevola sericea Forst. f. var. *taccada* Makino, Bot. Mag. (Tokyo) 18: 68, 1904.
Lobelia koenigii (Vahl) Wight in Safford, Contr. U. S. Nat. Her. 9: 310, 1905.
Scaevola frutescens (Mill.) Krause, Pflr. IV, 277: 125, 1912.
Scaevola frutescens var. *sericea* (Forst. f.) Merr., Phil. Jour. Sci. Bot. 7: 354, 1912.
Scaevola faurei Levl., Fedde, Repert. 10: 150, 1912.
Scaevola frutescens var. *taccada* (Mak.) Masamune, Prel. Rep. Veg. Yakushima 124, 1929.
Scaevola frutescens var. *glabra* (Matsum.) Masamune, Mem. Fac. Sci. Agr. Taihoku Univ. 11. Bot. (4): 436, 1934.
Scaevola frutescens f. *moomomiana* Degener & Greenwell, Fl. Haw. 340 S f, 12/1/1949.

Lobelia plumierii L. is seen to be the earliest available name for the composite species, including the Atlantic and Indo-Pacific plants. Linnaeus cited references to his Flora Zeylanicus and to both Plumier and Catesby, who deal strictly with the Atlantic form. In addition, he gives a short diagnosis which seems to fit the Atlantic plant somewhat better, though it is not conclusive. His selection of the epithet *plumierii* might be taken to indicate that he had Plumier's plant most in mind, but this is not adequate for typification. Gaertner, however, in 1788, clearly restricted *Lobelia plumierii* L. to the West Indian form, though he did not mention it by name, and applied his *Lobelia taccada* to the plant described in the earlier Indian and East Indian works, thus typifying *L. plumierii* unless it can be shown that Linnaeus'

treatment fits better the other way. This does not appear to be the case. Vahl, furthermore, in 1791, restricts *Scaevola plumierii* similarly, providing *S. sericea* and, in 1794, *S. koenigii*, for the Indo-Pacific species, reemphasizing and confirming Gaertner's judgement.

Scaevola lobelia Murr. is clearly a superfluous name for *Lobelia plumierii* L. as the latter is cited in synonymy under it. It is therefore illegitimate and need not be considered further.

When *L. plumierii* is thus restricted to the Atlantic species the next possible name is *Lobelia taccada* Gaertn. if there is no obstacle to its use in the genus *Scaevola*. It is generally assumed that this was transferred to *Scaevola* by Roxburgh in the Hortus Bengalensis. That this is not true will be seen on reference to the original publication. *S. taccada* Roxb. 1814 rests solely on the entry "19 H.M. 4 t. 59." which refers to Rheede's Hortus Malabaricus. The epithet *taccada* is taken from the vernacular name in Ceylon and mentioned in various early works. *Scaevola taccada* Roxb. 1820, however, is definitely based on *Lobelia taccada* Gaertner, and is therefore a later homonym of *S. taccada* Roxb. 1814 and hence illegitimate and unavailable, by strict application of the Code.

In the synonymy of his *Scaevola sericea* var. *taccada* Makino (Bot. Mag. Tokyo 18: 68, 1904) placed *Cerbera salutaris* Loureiro, Fl. Coch. 136, 1790. If this were a correct disposition Loureiro's epithet would be the next earliest available for the Indo-Pacific species. Merrill in his commentary on Loureiro's Flora (Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc. n.s. 24: 313, 1935) refers *Cerbera salutaris* to *Cerbera manghas* L. saying that the description essentially fits this species, though Loureiro's specimen in the British Museum is of *Scaevola frutescens* (Mill.) Krause. Examination of Loureiro's description and synonymy shows that this is indeed the case. The description is certainly not of *Scaevola*. The subulate calyx lobes and oblong corolla lobes which Merrill must have had in mind when he said "The characters are in small part those of *Scaevola frutescens*" may more likely to have come from *Ochrosia oppositifolia* (Lam.) Schum. (*Cerbera oppositifolia* Lam.) to which Willdenow referred *Cerbera salutaris* Lour. The two often grow together and may easily be confused. There really seems to be nothing in Loureiro's description that suggests that he had a specimen of *Scaevola* before him when he wrote it. Therefore the British Museum specimen can scarcely be regarded as the type. Merrill says (op. cit. p. 13) regarding the extant Loureiro specimens, "Probably some botanists would hesitate to accept these Loureiro specimens as actual "types" in the generally accepted sense of that word, particularly where Loureiro, himself, did not add his published binomial to the actual specimen. However, the specimens are at least those that Loureiro prepared to represent his genera and species; many of them bear the local names cited by him; others bear his published Latin names; and most of them doubtless represent material that he actually used in preparing his descriptions. As far as these specimens agree with his published descriptions, and as far as they can be correlated with the latter, my opinion is that they should be accepted as types." After thus expressing himself, Merrill referred *Cerbera salutaris* to *Cerbera manghas*, rather than to *Scaevola*. It would certainly be unfortunate to apply to the species of *Scaevola* under discussion a name whose description fits the plant in practically no respect. Therefore it seems best to follow Merrill's lead and not transfer Loureiro's epithet to *Scaevola*.

Scaevola sericea Vahl is not, as commonly supposed, a validation of *S. sericea* Forst. f. but is a new species clearly described by Vahl and based on a plant from Savage Island (Niue) in the central Pacific. Since this is three years earlier than the widely used *S. koenigii* Vahl it appears to be the earliest available name and the one that must be used for the species in question. It apparently applies strictly to the silky leafed plant, widespread in the Pacific, to which the name *S. frutescens*

var. *sericea* (Forst. f.) Merrill is commonly applied. The latter name is, in any event, illegitimate as it is based only on Forster's original publication. *Scaevola sericea* Forst. f. is without description or diagnosis, hence, combinations based upon it have no standing except as new names. Willdenow (Sp. Pl. 1: 956. 1789) and Robert Brown (Prodr. 283. 1810) associate it with descriptions but on the assumption that Vahl had done so previously, which is unfounded (see below).

Scaevola sericea Vahl is a very widespread species, extending from the western Indian Ocean eastward to Ducie Atoll in the Pacific and north to the Hawaiian Islands, the Bonin Islands and Tanegashima in southern Japan and from sea level to at least 300 m. altitude. As would be expected it is highly variable, though this variation is not at all well understood. It is not considered advisable to make the combinations under *Scaevola sericea* for such entities as Matsumura's var. *glabra* and Degener's f. *moomomiana*, although glabrous and velutinous forms unquestionably exist. A critical analysis, even of such herbarium material as exists, would undoubtedly result in a far better understanding of the pattern of variation. Preferable would be an extensive investigation involving also field studies, mass-collection techniques, and cytological preparations. If a biological field station located on a coral atoll were adequately staffed to carry out investigations of this nature this species would provide an admirable subject for research into the nature of the variation in strand species.

THE UNIVERSITY HERBARIUM, LIVERPOOL

by

V. H. Heywood (Liverpool)*

The existence of an important and sizeable herbarium at Liverpool University is not generally realized by outside workers. The herbarium which was founded in 1889 has had a chequered history and has received little attention during the past two decades. As a complete reorganisation is now under way and the collections being rehoused, it was thought that a preliminary account of the history and content of the herbarium would be of interest to other institutions and taxonomists.

Since its foundation till 1893 there were no considerable acquisitions and the total number of specimens was about 4000. At this date, however, the large and important collections of A. E. Lomax of the Northern Dispensary (an obituary will be found in *Journ. Bot. London* 32: 384. 1894) were purchased by subscribers and the size of the University College (as it was then) herbarium was increased to about 50,000 specimens. Apart from small collections presented by Hon. Mrs. Steuart (English plants) and by Dr. A. J. Ewart from Java and Ceylon, and assorted material received from Kew and the British Museum and from Oxford, Cambridge and Chelsea Botanic Gardens, there were no major additions until the presentation by T. Comber of his large herbarium and library in 1900, the latter containing some early herbals at present housed in the Harold Cohen Library of the University.

By 1907 there were apparently over 200,000 specimens in the Liverpool herbarium and the following year the collections of the Reverend W. R. Linton, author of the *Flora of Derbyshire: Account of the British Hieracia*, etc., were presented by his widow. A memoir of Linton was published in *Journ. Bot. London* 46: 65 (1908). In 1914 the herbarium of Dr. Joseph Dickinson was deposited in the University Botany Department and incorporated in the general collections. Dickinson was

*) The Hartley Botanical Laboratories, The University, Liverpool, 3, England.

lecturer in Botany in the Medical School of the Liverpool Royal Institution and was author of the *Flora of Liverpool*, 1851. His herbarium contained a more or less complete flora of the Liverpool district and three thousand foreign ferns and flowering plants. During the war years the herbarium was attacked by beetles, etc., and a great quantity of material had to be thrown away when the collections were reorganised in 1919—20.

The herbarium at present numbers over 100,000 specimens of flowering plants and ferns, mostly European and made up in the main of well known sets of exsiccata, including a rich representation of Spanish and Mediterranean material with a large number of Boissier, Kotschy, Heldreich, Huter, Porta and Rigo type-gatherings. There are also important early collections from North and South America, Australia, Abyssinia, China, etc. The Lomax herbarium includes a considerable number of Spanish plants received from Carlos Pau of Segorbe, Spain, the majority of his own gathering but some collected by Zapater. Material of these two botanists is extremely rare outside their original herbaria. One of the features of the Linton herbarium is the valuable and extensive collection of *Hieracia*, including several types.

The herbarium of John Forbes Royle, M.D., F.R.S., Director of the Natural History Collections of the East India Company, was presented to the Liverpool Royal Institution by his widow in 1859. This herbarium which comprises an important early collection of Himalayan plants became the property of the University in 1948 when the remaining collections of the Institution were transferred to Liverpool University. It is at present in the City Museum.

The algal herbarium comprising at present about 5,000 sheets is being completely reorganized and extended by Dr. E. M. Burrows and Dr. P. Dixon. Information regarding this herbarium is published in the Bulletin of the British Phycological Society.

The bryophyte collections, numbering some 12,000 specimens, include those made by W. R. Linton.

Our thanks are due to Professor H. A. Ormerod for his invaluable assistance with the historical data.

Dr. V. H. Heywood, the present curator and lecturer in Systematic Botany, is engaged on the following research: —

Flora of the Iberian Peninsula.
Floristic studies in the Mediterranean region.
The European Flora.
The genus *Digitalis*.
Compositae-Chrysanthemineae.

Dr. S. Walker, lecturer in Cytogenetics, is working on: —

Cytogenetics and taxonomy of the *Dryopteris spinulosa* complex in Europe and North America.
Cytotaxonomy of the genus *Dryopteris* in North America.

Supervision is being undertaken of work by research students in: —

The genus *Callitriche* in the British Isles.
Spergularia and allied genera in the British Isles.

Biosystematic or cytotaxonomic studies are being started by Drs. Heywood and Walker in the following groups: —

Erophila (British and European).
Draba (British and European).
Digitalis (whole genus).
Helianthemum (British and Mediterranean) and allied genera.
Narcissus spp.
East-West Mediterranean vicariads.

TAXONOMIE UND NOMENKLATUR

von

Werner Rothmaler (Greifswald)

Das Vorhaben des „Index Nominum Genericorum", das einen Teil der Taxonomen aus der ganzen Welt jetzt zu gemeinsamer Arbeit zusammengeführt hat, zwingt zu einer klaren Unterscheidung von Nomenklatur und Taxonomie. Die Typenmethode ist durchaus dazu geeignet, die reinen Nomenklaturfragen zunächst unabhängig von taxonomischen Problemen zu lösen, wenn man sich auch immer darüber klar sein muss, dass die Nomenklatur nur ein Hilfsmittel der Taxonomie darstellt und in der Konsequenz nicht von ihr getrennt werden kann. Die Taxonomie muss notwendigerweise Deutung enthalten, während die auf der Typenmethode aufbauende Nomenklatur, die Deutungsfragen weitgehend ausschliessend, relativ schnell zu eindeutigen und objektiven Ergebnissen führt.

Leider aber gilt das nicht allgemein, denn es gibt Nomenklaturfragen, bei deren Lösung erst die Wahl eines Typus zum Ziel führen kann, wenn nämlich vom Autor auch implicite kein Typus angegeben ist. Gewiss geben uns die Grundregeln zur Wahl eines Neo- und Lectotypus recht gute Anhaltspunkte, wie man auch in solchen Fällen zu einem Typus gelangen kann, ohne die taxonomische Deutung heranzuziehen. Dennoch gibt es Fälle, in denen offensichtlich solche Methoden zu Fehlschlüssen führen, wenn die Taxonomie nicht zur Hilfe herangezogen wird. Glücklicherweise werden die Nomenklaturfragen meistens von Taxonomen, die mehr oder weniger in dieser Richtung spezialisiert sind, gelöst. Doch immer wieder tauchen in der Literatur Fälle auf, in denen der Versuch gemacht wird so zweifelhafte Fragen ohne Berücksichtigung der Taxonomie zu lösen.

Für den „Index Nominum Genericorum" ergibt sich mehrfach die Notwendigkeit, die Bedeutung eines Gattungsnamens in der älteren Literatur aus der Beschreibung zu klären, wenn überhaupt kein Artname im Zusammenhang genannt wird, wie es z.B. oft bei Ludwig, Def. gen. pl. (1760), der Fall ist. Bei andern Autoren werden mehrere Artnamen genannt, aus denen ein Typus zu wählen ist, wobei man sich zur Richtschnur stets das Grundprinzip des Code wählen sollte: To aim at fixity of names.

Neuerdings hat H. P. Fuchs versucht, alte Gattungsnamen von Pteridophyten zu typisieren, wobei er zu Resultaten kommt, die nicht unwidersprochen bleiben können. Es handelt sich in dem hier zu besprechenden Fall*) um den Gattungsnamen *Mirmau* Adans., den ich als Beispiel solcher Typisierungsmethoden anführen möchte. *Mirmau* wird von Adanson mit einer Beschreibung versehen, die sich ganz auf *Selaginella selaginoides* bezieht. Das ist eindeutig, vor allem in der Beschreibung der Heterosporie, aber auch in der der vegetativen Organe ausgedrückt. Als Synonyme zitiert Adanson hierzu *Selaginoides* Dillenius und *Selago* Dillenius. H. P. Fuchs verzichtet bei seinen Untersuchungen völlig auf die Berücksichtigung der Beschreibung und beschäftigt sich allein mit den Synonymen, wobei er autoritativ das Synonym *Selago* zum Typus von *Mirmau* erklärt. Den Satz (Adans. p. 489) „surtout l'espèce de Mirmau, appellée par Tournefort *Muscus squamosus abietiformis*" interpretiert er so, „dass für Adanson die Gattung *Mirmau* Adanson ein monotypisches Genus war, aufgebaut auf *Lycopodium Selago* L.".

Später gibt H. P. Fuchs selbst zu, dass die Anführung des zweiten Synonyms *Selaginoides* nicht mit seiner Auffassung von einem monotypischen Genus in Einklang zu bringen ist. Aber auch den oben zitierten Satz Adansons kann ich nicht

*) H. P. Fuchs in Verh. Naturf. Ges. Basel 66 (1) 33-48 : 1955 cfr. Taxon IV (8) 199 : 1955.

so verstehen, wie es H. P. Fuchs wünscht. Er bedeutet meiner Auffassung: „vor allem die von Tournefort als *Muscus squamosus abietiformis* bezeichnete *Mirmau*-Art" oder „vor allem die *Mirmau*-Art, die Tournefort *Muscus squamosus abietiformis* benennt". Keinesfalls kann aus diesem Satz abgeleitet werden, dass die Gattung *Mirmau* nur diese eine Art enthalten sollte.

Es soll hier nicht auf die Frage der richtigen Benennung von *Lycopodium selago* L. eingegangen werden*). *Mirmau* Adans. emend. H. P. Fuchs dient hier nur als Beispiel für eine von jeder taxonomischen Betrachtung losgelöste Nomenklatorik. Es erscheint ausser Zweifel, dass diese Fragen auch für den „Index Nominum Genericorum" von entscheidender Bedeutung sind. Es erhebt sich sogar die Frage, ob nicht im Codex bzw. in den Anweisungen zur Typenmethode auf die Gattungstypisierung noch ausführlicher eingegangen werden sollte. An sich ist in diesen Anweisungen zum Ausdruck gebracht worden, dass man nicht so vorgehen kann und darf, wie es durch H. P. Fuchs geschah. Es wäre aber doch zu erörtern, ob man nicht lieber bisher nicht typisierte Gattungsnamen ganz verwerfen sollte. Dazu wäre es vorteilhaft, diese Fragen in „Taxon" zu diskutieren, da für unsere Vorhaben Einheitlichkeit und Klarheit besonders notwendig sind.

REGNUM VEGETABILE

News Edition

INDEX HERBARIORUM

The second edition of *'The Herbaria of the World'*, published in January 1954 is exhausted and it is planned to issue a third, revised edition in the Spring of 1956. The authors kindly request all readers to send further information, either supplementary or new, before 1 March 1956.

Directors of Institutes already listed in the first and second edition of the book have received a new questionnaire on which mutations and alterations can be indicated. If they have not yet returned this questionnaire, they are urged to do so at their earliest convenience.

All institutional members and all regular personal members of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy will receive one free copy. It is not necessary to order free copies.

The price for non-members, associate personal members and that of extra-copies for regular members is D.fl. 13.30.

*

WORLD REPORT ON PALAEOBOTANY

Rapport sur la Paléobotanique dans le Monde (1950—1954) présenté par l'Organisation Internationale de la Paléobotanique (I.O.P.).

World Report on Palaeobotany (1950—1954) presented by the International Organization of Palaeobotany (I.O.P.).

*

Ce travail constitue, avec la 2e partie qui suit, le *"World Report on Palaeobotany"* des années 1950—1954. Il s'agit de l'une des premières réalisations concrètes de l'"International Organization of Palaeobotany" (I.O.P.).

Le but de ces *"World Reports on Palaeobotany"* est de mettre à la disposition des chercheurs un système de documentation à la fois complet et rapide. Après les tâtonnements du début, un tel ensemble d'informations bibliographiques peut devenir rapidement annuel. Il est le type même d'une oeuvre d'intérêt général établie sur une base de coopération internationale.

La publication du World Report sera d'autant plus rapide que les Paléobotanistes du monde entier auront davantage pris conscience du rôle que l'on attend d'eux au sein d'une telle organisation internationale dont ils auront compris le fonctionnement et apprécié le caractère essentiellement collectif.

La réalisation qui est tentée ici n'est pas nouvelle. Elle s'est fortement inspirée des expériences antérieures et notamment des *"Reports of the Committee on Paleobotany"*

---

*) Über die Eindeutigkeit und die Typisierung von *Huperzia* Bernh. werde ich an anderer Stelle berichten.

publiés par le "*National Research Council*" des USA, des deux "*European reports on Paleobotany*" édités par O. Selling de 1939 à 1949, et des revues publiées régulièrement aux Indes: "Palaeobotany in India".

L'inconvenient de chacun de ces travaux est de ne représenter qu'une partie seulement de la littérature mondiale. C'est pourquoi il a paru souhaitable que l'ensemble des travaux publiées dans le monde entier soit rassemblé en une seule publication. D'autre part les bibliographies de détail des différents travaux sont très souvent incomplètes car elles ne tiennent compte en réalité que des périodiques qui parviennent régulièrement dans un seul pays, c'est-à-dire une fraction assez faible de ceux qui sont effectivement publiés. Un recueil bibliographique complet et mondial est donc particulièrement utile.

*

The "World Report on Palaeobotany (1950-1954)" will be issued in the course of the Spring of 1956. Further technical details will be given in future issues of Taxon.

News and Notes

MISSOURI BOTANICAL GARDEN SYMPOSIUM ON SYSTEMATICS

A symposium on the "Contribution of Systematics to Evolutionary Studies" was held at the Missouri Botanical Garden on November 4 and 5. This was the second annual meeting of botanists and zoologists, principally of the midwest, to be held at the Garden for the purpose of encouraging exchange of ideas on systematic problems fundamental to biology. Sixty-two staff members and fifty-nine graduate students from thirty-one institutions and fifteen states were in attendance. Dr Karl P. Schmidt of the Chicago Natural History Museum, and Dr Reed C. Rollins of the Gray Herbarium, Harvard University guided the discussions. A few short papers were presented on morphological variation, geographical distribution, phylogenetic trees, and the nature and origin of taxonomic categories. Each paper served as a stimulus to extended discussion of relevant information from both plants and animals.

The symposium served to raise many problems for discussion for which there were no ready answers, as well as providing concrete information on clines, taxonomic methods, geographical step by step replacement of animal and plant species. The afternoon session on phylogeny left an encouraging feeling on the possibility of making sense out of some groups, as well as showing that not only has systematics contributed to evolutionary studies, but also that evolution has greatly influenced systematics.

The Symposium was generously supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation which made it possible for many, particularly graduate students, to attend.

EDWARD DAVIS.

THE GEORGE R. COOLEY AWARDS IN TAXONOMIC BOTANY

Through the generosity of Mr George R. Cooley, the American Society of Plant Taxonomists has been enabled to offer two cash awards yearly for a period of five years. One of these annual awards carries an honorarium of $ 500., the other an honorarium of $ 100.

The larger award of $ 500. is to be given for a published paper based on original research and concerned largely with the taxonomy of plants of the Southeastern United States, including the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Louisiania, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee. Papers published in the calendar year prior to that in which the award is given will be considered by a committee of the American Society of Plant Taxonomists appointed for the purpose. The committee will select an award paper using excellence as the primary guide. Any and all phases of the paper and the research reported upon may be taken into account. If, in the judgement of the committee, no paper is submitted that is meritorious and of sufficiently high quality, the award may be postponed and the over all period in which awards will be given will thus be extended.

The committee to administer the above award is composed of Dr DONOVAN S. CORRELL, Chairman (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Plant Introduction Section, Beltsville, Maryland), Dr HAROLD W. RICKETT (New York Botanical Garden, Bronx Park, New York 58, N. Y.); Dr EDGAR T. WHERRY (Botanical Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pa.). Papers for consideration should be sent to Dr CORRELL.

The smaller award of $ 100. is to be given

for an oral paper on any phase of plant taxonomy delivered before the membership of the American Society of Plant Taxonomists at the program of its annual meeting. All papers given on the program will be considered and judged on their excellence by a committee consisting of Dr Robert T. Clausen, Chairman (Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.); Dr J. M. Fogg (Morris Arboretum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.); and Dr H. L. Mason (University of California, Berkeley 4, California).

Papers presented at the next annual meeting to be held at the University of Connecticut, Storrs, August 26—30, 1956, will be considered for the award.

R. C. Rollins, Secretary
American Society of Plant Taxonomists.

CITRULLUS

Citrullus vulgaris Schrader still correct

In a recent article (Taxon 4 : 198. 1955) A. D. J. Meeuse calls the attention of the Committee on Stabilization to Hara's contention (Taxon 2 : 134-135. 1953) that with the conservation of *Citrullus* Schrader the correct name of the watermelon is *Citrullus anguria* (Duch.) Hara. He then suggests that the Committee perform some sort of „stabilization" on the binomial *Citrullus vulgaris* Schrader, advancing a number of excellent reasons for preferring to retain the latter name.

Meeuse overlooks the fact (pointed out in Taxon 3 : 2. 1954) that *Cucurbita anguria* Duch., on which *Citrullus anguria* was based, is an illegitimate name, superfluous when published, and therefore cannot be transferred to displace any later name. *Citrullus vulgaris* Schrader is consequently still the correct name for the watermelon, so long as its current generally accepted circumscription is maintained. However, Bailey (Gentes Herbarium 2 : 87. 1929) makes the wild bitter watermelon of South Africa, originally described as *Momordica lanata* Thunb. Prodr. Fl. Cap. 13. 1794, a variety of *Citrullus vulgaris*. If this circumscription is accepted no amount of stabilization can save the binomial *Citrullus vulgaris*.

This may be cited as an example, by no means an unusual one, of how proper application of the Code promotes rather than retards stability of names so long as taxonomic opinions do not change. It may also be used as an occasion to point out that the Code, as it now stands, is a result of almost a hundred years of concerted and earnest effort on the part of gatherings of some of the most able botanists, starting with Alphonse DeCandolle, to deal with the very problem of stabilization of the names of plants. This Code is actually a remarkably effective document. It seems safe to say that any reasonably intelligent person can, if he ascertains all of the facts and carefully applies the Code, arrive at the correct name of almost any plant. This can be done without referring the matter to any committee and without the consequent risk of establishing bodies of judicial precedent or ponderous official lists. The alternative to this clear, relatively simple code may be tried out by anyone who cares to attempt to determine the correct names of any random selection of animals by application of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, where difficult problems are referred to a committee.

The point that must not be overlooked is that all of the pertinent facts are needed before any code can be applied successfully or, for that matter before any committee can deal with nomenclatural matters. Much of the confusion in nomenclature to which everyone objects is the direct result of disregard of available facts by the proposers of names in the past.

F. R. Fosberg
Falls Church, Va.

SCIRPUS MILIACEUS L.

In Taxon 3 : 246 (1954) J. H. Kern refused to accept my interpretation of *Scirpus miliaceus* L. in Journ. Arnold Arb. 35 : 216 (1954). His objection was based on the following points:

1. A change of application of a well-known name.
2. The fact that there are two sheets in the Linnaean Herbarium, one of which bears a specimen of the species that has commonly been called *Fimbristylis miliaceus* (L.) Vahl (a statement based on a passage that I quoted from a letter from Mr. E. Nelmes).
3. A belief that there is no evidence that the specimen marked "miliaceus" by Linnaeus was used by Linnaeus in drawing up his description.
4. A belief that both specimens agree with Linnaeus's description.
5. C. B. Clarke's statement that specimens in the Linnaean Herbarium are not necessarily the types of the Linnaean names.

With regard to the first point, nobody

regrets the change more than I do. I have been familiar with both species for more than twenty years and I can assure Dr Kern that the matter was considered long and carefully before the paper was published. The last point has no bearing on the present case because Linnaeus gave no references; his description must have been based on plant material before him. The third and fourth points must be considered together, and it should be understood that the statement that both specimens agree with the description is the opinion of Mr. Kern, not of Mr. Nelmes. While it is true that Linnaeus's brief description in Syst. Veg. ed. 10 : 868 (1759) could apply to either specimen, his account in Sp. Pl. ed. 2 : 75 (1762) definitely refers to one and excludes the other. In this account the leaves were described as "graminea, basin culmi obvestientia" and the spikelets as "omnes ovatae". Of the two species concerned, only the one generally referred to as *Fimbristylis quinquangularis* Kunth has grass-like leaves surrounding the base of the culms and ovate (ovoid) spikelets; the other has leaves in flabellate tufts between the culms and the spikelets are globose or nearly so. Surely there can be no doubt that Linnaeus had in mind only the specimen marked "miliaceus" that Nelmes and I have accepted as the type of *Scirpus miliaceus*, and it must be inferred that the second sheet was acquired considerably later. It is unfortunate that I did not stress the Linnaean accounts in my paper, but I must confess that at that time I had not seen the account in Syst. Veg. ed. 10, and had not realized it was so much shorter than that in Sp. Pl. ed. 2.

The case of *Scirpus miliaceus* is not unique, even in the Cyperaceae, and unless some provision is introduced into the International Code of Nomenclature to allow the designation of a fresh type by Act of Congress or other means to permit the conservation of a traditional misapplication of a specific epithet we must face the facts and follow the Code.

S. T. Blake.

Mirmau Adanson versus Urostachys Herter nom. cons. prop.

H. P. Fuchs in a recent paper *) holds the view that if *Lycopodium* L. has to be split in two, it would be necessary to accept the generic name *Mirmau* Adanson for the genus including *Lycopodium selago* L.

This opinion is not correct as *Mirmau* Adans. is an illegitimate generic name, according to Art. 73 (1) and 61 of the Code. Adanson, Fam. des Plantes 2, 1763, wrote on page 491:

"Mirmau. Offic. Siles.
Selago. Dill. Musc. t. 56.
Selaginoides. Dill. t. 68".

On page 579:

"Mirmau. *Offic. Siles.* 491
Selago. *Dillen.*
Selaginoides. *Dillen*".

On page 603:

"Selaginoides *Dill.* V. *Mirmau*".

No type (species) was designated at that time.

Adanson's first synonym *Selago* Dill. Musc. *t. 56, (f. 1)* is apparently identical with *Lycopodium selago* L. (Sp. Pl. 1102. 1753).

Linné mentions in the synonymy "Selago . . Dill. Musc. 435. 5. 56. f. 1". Ludwig (Defin. 484. 1760) revived Dillenius' generic name, but this is a later homonym of *Selago* L. (1753), which is a Scrophulariacea. The second synonym *Selaginoides* Dill. was accepted as a distinct genus by Ludwig (Defin. 484. 1760). I cite "1208. Selaginoides Dill. Syn. III. 106. Musc. p. 460. Hall. Helv. 94. Polycocca Hill. 116". Selaginoides Dill. is mentioned by Linné (Sp. Pl. 1101, 1102. 1753) under *Lycopodium selaginoides* L. ("Selaginoides foliis spinosis. Dill. Musc. 460, t. 88, f. 1"). It is evident from the foregoing that *Mirmau* Adans. is illegitimate under Art. 73 (1), being a superfluous generic name for *Selaginoides* Dill. ex Ludw., cited by Adanson as a synonym; the latter omitted, however, the reference to Ludwig's Definitiones, a book otherwise well known to him as appears from his references.

R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink Jr.

NOCH EINMAL UROSTACHYS

Soeben kommt mir ein in Taxon (3 : 199. 1954) erschienener, mit *Urostachys* überschriebener und W. Rothmaler gezeichneter Artikel zu Gesicht, der nach Form und Inhalt geeignet ist, mich verächtlich zu machen und in der öffentlichen Meinung herabzuwürdigen.

Ich weise zunächst die unter das Strafgesetz fallende beleidigende Form aufs Schärfste zurück und gehe zur Sache über.

Es wird mir vorgeworfen, ich behaupte "wider besseres Wissen", Bernhardi hätte zu seiner Gattung *Huperzia* keine Species genannt. Es könne mir nicht entgangen sein, dass er die Gattung auf *Huperzia selago* (L.) Bernh. typisiert.

*) Verh. Naturf. Ges. Basel 66(1) : 33-48. 1955.

Dazu bemerke ich folgendes: Es ist mir allerdings nicht entgangen, dass Rothmaler in Feddes Repertorium 54 : 59 (1944), die obige Kombination mit Bernhardi als Autor bildet. Das ist aber falsch. In meiner Eingabe an den Pariser Kongress (vide Taxon 3 : 129-30) habe ich bewusst über diesen wie über andere Fehler Rothmalers in der genannten Arbeit hinweggesehen, da bei den Vorschlägen für die Genera conservanda grösste Kürze geboten war und ich kein Freund davon bin, die Irrtümer anderer unnötigerweise in der Öffentlichkeit breitzutreten. Es genügte also, dass ich in bewusstem Gegensatz zu Rothmaler sagte, Bernhardi hätte den Namen *Huperzia* ohne Nennung von Species publiziert, und diese Behauptung halte ich voll und ganz aufrecht. Ich bitte die Fachgenossen, die sich für die Sache interessieren, sich durch Nachschlagen der von Rothmaler (l.c. p. 58) zitierten Stelle in Schraders Journal für die Botanik, 2(1) : 126 (1801), von der Richtigkeit meiner Behauptung zu überzeugen. Bernhardi hat übrigens bald darauf sein Genus *Huperzia* zurückgezogen und erst Trevisan hat im Jahre 1874 die obige Kombination gebildet, worauf mich Herr Kollege Fuchs (Basel) aufmerksam machte unter Übersendung einer Photokopie der Trevisanschen, in Vergessenheit geratenen Publikation.

Auch die weiteren Unterstellungen sind abwegig. Rothmaler versetzt wohl zahlreiche Sektionen, Subsektionen, Series und Species meiner Gattung *Urostachys* in die Gattung *Huperzia* unter Beigabe seines Namens (dass er diesen unberechtigterweise auch vielen, ich zähle 34, Kombinationen Trevisans beifügt, nur nebenbei), es fehlen aber noch Hunderte von *Urostachys*-Arten, die notwendigerweise umgetauft werden müssen, wenn *Huperzia* angenommen wird.

So und nicht anders habe ich es mit den "notwendigen Umtaufungen" gemeint. Was dabei völlig aus der Luft gegriffen sein soll, ist mir schleierhaft. Rothmaler hat zwei meiner Arbeiten von 1909 und 1923 benutzt (nicht ich die seine, wie er sagt), leider nicht die übrigen, ins besondere nicht meinen Index Lycopodiorum vom Jahre 1949, den er 1944 allerdings noch nicht kannte, sonst hätte er wohl nicht geschrieben: Die Gattung umfasst nach Herter ungefähr 150 Arten. Dass eine nur aus *Huperzia*-Arten bestehende Familie "konsequenterweise" *Huperziaceae* heissen sollte, ist meine Privatmeinung, über die es nicht verlohnt, zu diskutieren.

Jedenfalls trete ich nach wie vor für die Beibehaltung des Gattungsnamens *Urostachys* ein, schon aus dem von mir am Schluss der Eingabe an den Kongress (Taxon 3 : 130) angeführten, von Rothmaler übergangenen Grunde, weil sich sonst über 400 Umtaufungen ergeben würden. HERTER.

ASTROCHLAENA Hallier, Nom. Cons. Prop.

A proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Astrochlaena* Hallier f. (1893) was published in Taxon 4 : 198. 1955. The secretary of the Committee for Palaeobotanical nomenclature draws the attention to the fact that the name *Asterochlaena* Garcke (nomen rejiciendum propositum) is antedated by *Asterochlaena* Corda (Beiträge zur Flora der Vorwelt p. 81. 1845).

PERSONALIA

Mr. G. CHIPPENDALE, formerly Assistant Botanist at New South Wales National Herbarium, Sydney, has been appointed Botanist, Animal Industry Branch, Alice Springs, Northern Territory, Australia. He has been in this newly created position since July 1954, and has begun building up a herbarium of Central Australian plants with a view to producing a flora of that area. Later, a study may be made of the northern "wet country" region. Special study is also given to poison plants and edible plants. Mr. Chippendale will soon be able to exchange specimens with other herbaria interested in arid flora. Specimens have already been distributed to Australian States herbaria.

*

Dr. W. H. HODGE, until recently Principal Botanist and Assistant Head of the Plant Introduction Section of the United States Department of Agriculture, has taken up new duties as Head of the Education Department, Longwood Gardens of the Longwood Foundation, Inc., Kennett Square, Pennsylvania.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

The Editorial Committee held a meeting at Utrecht from 14—18 November 1955 in order to discuss the final composition of the text of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature as adopted by the Paris Botanical Congress.

A report of this meeting will be found on p. 1 of this number of Taxon.

The committee decided to coopt Dr R. C. ROLLINS, Gray Herbarium of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A. as a member.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STABILIZATION

The following report was submitted to the Council and Members of the *Society of American Foresters* by its *ad hoc* Committee on Tree Names. The report deals with the stabilization of important tree nomenclature and is herewith brought to the attention of the Special Committee on Stabilization of the International Botanical Congress.

The report, which is dated 17 October 1955, reads as follows:

(1) The need, in behalf of horticulturists, agronomists, foresters, physiologists, biochemists, pathologists and other biological workers, for a measure of relief from an unsettled nomenclature, has been set forth with great clarity and emphasis by Dr. Wendell H. Camp (now head of the Department of Botany, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., and a former president of the American Society of Plant Taxonomists) in his article "Codes, Taxonomic Coding, and Types" Taxonomic Index 17(4, 5) : 45—48, Sep.-Oct., 1954.

(2) As a committee of the Society of American Foresters we welcome the opportunity thus afforded foresters to contribute to a discussion of this problem and to help, if possible, in some reasonable solution.

(3) Article 4 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (Utrecht, 1952) states that the first essential point in nomenclature is "To aim at fixity of names." We are in hearty agreement with such an aim, and recommend renewed attention to that aim on the part of future framers of the Code.

(4) We unanimously recommend to the Society that it endorse the *principle* embodied in the article by Dr. Elbert L. Little, Jr., "Rejection of Obscure Plant Names Unaccepted within a Century" Phytologia 3(3) : 87-89. July, 1949 under which the priority rule (Article 16 of the Code) could be modified to outlaw changes due to the discovery of an obscure name a century or more old. Some members of the committee, however, think this period could be reduced, say, to 50, 25 or even 10 years. Incidentally, such a revision of the priority rule would be in harmony with Article C. 12 of the "Proposed International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants" published as Appendix III of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.

(5) The International Botanical Congress at Amsterdam in 1935 appointed "A Special Committee for Nomenclature of Economic Plants, "the purpose of which was to prepare a sort of check list of such plants, primarily for nontaxonomists. That list was never completed. Our committee, with one dissenting vote, suggest that our Society recommend reappointment of such a committee for economic plant nomenclature, *provided suitable personnel can be obtained.*

(6) The Committee membership divides 50—50 on the desirability of lists of *nomina specifica conservanda* and *nomina specifica rejicienda.* In view of what has happened at previous international botanical congresses it realizes the latter has a much better chance of adoption than the former. If we can get a modification of the priority rule as indicated under "(4)" above or a kind of standard economic plant list as indicated under "(5)" above such lists of conserved or rejected specific names might not be needed to obtain the relief desired.

(7) The committee unanimously recommends that, by one or more of the methods indicated above, use of the scientific name *Pseudotsuga taxifolia,* the most important timber tree of the United States, if not in the world, be legalized. By the same token, but with one dissenting vote, your committee also recommends effort to legalize the following scientific names of two important American trees, *Sequoia gigantea* and *Betula lutea,* and agreement to accept *Populus balsamifera (vice P. tacamahacca)* for balsam poplar and *Quercus rubra (vice Q. borealis)* for northern red oak, the latter two names in question because of typification problems.

Respectfully submitted,

(Washington D.C. 17 Oct. 1955)

HENRY I. BALDWIN, Fox Research Forest, Hillsboro, New Hampshire.

KEITH W. DORMAN, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Dry Branch, Georgia.

JOHN W. DUFFIELD, Industrial Forestry Association, Portland 5, Oregon.

PHILIP G. HADDOCK, University of British Columbia, Faculty of Forestry, Vancouver 8, B.C., Canada.

ELBERT L. LITTLE, Jr., U.S. Forest Service, Washington 25, D.C.

WILLIAM A. DAYTON, Chairman, U.S. Forest Service, Washington 25, D.C.

PSEUDOTSUGA TAXIFOLIA

(Poiret) Britton

versus

P. MENZIESII (Mirbel) Franco

In view of the importance of the legitimate retention under the present Code of Botanical Nomenclature of the name *Pseudotsuga taxifolia* we are giving here the main contents of the paper by Boivin, written in Latin, published in the Boletim da Sociedade Broteriana 28 : 63-64. 1954.

The name *Pseudotsuga taxifolia* (Poiret) Britton has as its basionym the name *Abies taxifolia* Poiret 1806 ('1805'). This basionym was considered illegitimate by Amaral Franco (ib. 24 : 73-77. 1950) on account of the existence of the earlier 'homonyms' *Abies taxifolia* Du Tour 1803 and *Abies taxifolia* Desfontaines 1804. Boivin points out that both names are not validly published under the present Code. In order to be treated as an earlier homonym it is necessary for a name to be validly published: names not so published have no status under the Code. Du Tour's name (1803) is published in synonymy and Art. 46 of the Stockholm Code reads: 'A name of a taxon is not validly published when it is merely cited as a synonym'. Desfontaines' name (1804) is not provided with a description: such *'nomina nuda'* are also to be ignored for all purposes (see Art. 42). The name *Abies taxifolia* Poiret 1806 is therefore legitimate under our present knowledge and consequently the name *Pseudotsuga taxifolia* (Poiret) Britton is also legitimate. F. A. S.

(See also the article by H. C. D. de Wit in this number of Taxon).

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH: PLANT TAXONOMY

A vacation course in Taxonomy as it is practiced in the Herbarium will be given by P. H. Davis, Ph. D. in the University Department of Botany, Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh 4, from September 3rd—15th., 1956. The course will include 6 lectures and the taxonomic revision of selected groups done under close personal supervision. Further particulars may be obtained from Dr Davis at the above address.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Contributions to this column will be gratefully received by Mr. K. U. Kramer, Botanical Museum, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands.

Carices of the Far East

S. Akiyama: *Carices* of the Far Eastern Region of Asia. Vol. I, 257 pp. (text, in Japanese); Vol. II, plates 1-248 (explanations in Japanese and English). Sapporo, Japan, 1955.

Flora of Madagascar

G. Cufodontis: 92. *Pittosporaceae.*

B. P. G. Hochreutiner: 129. *Malvaceae.*

H. Perrier de la Bathie & B. P. G. Hochreutiner: 130. *Bombacaceae.* (all Paris, 1955).

Flora of Corsica

R. de Litardière: Prodrome de la flore Corse, III, 2. (*Cuscuta* by T. G. Yuncker). Paris, 1955. XVII + 264 pp.

Flora of Morocco

Ch. Sauvage & J. Vindt: Flore du Maroc, Spermatophytes II. *Convolvulaceae, Boraginaceae.* Tanger, 1954. XVI + 267 pp., 4 pl., 1 map. 55 figs.

Melastomataceae

H. Jacques-Felix, Icones Plantarum Africanarum, fasc. 3 : *Melastomataceae africanae.*

* * *

Monographs, revisions, etc., published in periodicals

R. S. Adamson: The South African species of *Aizoaceae.* I. *Adenogramma* and *Polpoda.* Journ. S. Afr. Bot. XXI (II) : 83-95 (1955).

K. L. Chambers: A biosystematic study of the annual species of *Microseris.* Contr. Dudley Herb. 4(7) : 207-312 (1955).

H. E. Moore, Jr.: *Pelargoniums* in cultivation II. A key to groups of species. Baileya 3(2) : 71-97 (1955).

M. Ryberg: A taxonomical survey of the genus *Corydalis* Ventenat, with reference to cultivated species. Acta Hort. Berg. 17(5) : 115-175 (1955).

R. C. Rollins: A revisionary study of the genus *Menonvillea* (Cruciferae). Contr. Gray Herbarium 177 : 1-57 (1955).

W. J. Harley: The Ferns of Liberia. Contr. Gray Herbarium 177 : 58-103 (1955).

SPECIES LUPINORUM

The Dudley Herbarium has recently agreed to dispose of the available copies of *Species Lupinorum,* the private journal published by Dr Charles Piper Smith. It is planned to sell the journal at considerably less than list price and all proceeds of the sale will go to Dr Smith's widow. *Species Lupinorum* was issued in 44 separate signatures and it is planned to sell these for 50 cts for individual

numbers or $ 15.00 for complete sets, unbound. There are about 45 complete sets unbound and several hundred additional numbers of the earlier issues. Also available are 20 copies of Signatures 1-12, bound, and 5 copies of Signatures 13-28, bound, which are sold at $ 6.00 each (completing the series, if desired, with Signatures 29-44, unbound, for $ 6.00).

Orders should be adressed and remittances made payable to Prof. Richard W. Holm, Curator of the Dudley Herbarium, Natural History Museum, Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.

Office

The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

Membership Fees

Members are requested to pay their membership fees to the regional treasurers.

Members in countries without regional treasurers are requested to make payable their subscriptions to *Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, Netherlands,* crossed: *"a.c. International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy".*

	$	£	D.fl.	Sw.Kr.
A. Individual Persons				
Regular Members	3.—	1.1.—	11.40	15.90
Associate Members	1.—	—.7.—	3.80	5.30
B. Institutes, Societies, etc.				
Supporting Members	50.—	17.10.—	190.—	265.—
Regular Members	25.—	8.15.—	95.—	132.50
Associate Members	10.—	3.10.—	38.—	53.—

Payments can be made in any currency; remittances in other currencies than those listed above are accepted against the exchange rates of the day of payment.

Council 1954-1959

President: R. C. Rollins, Cambridge, Mass.; *Vice-President:* W. Robyns, Bruxelles; *Secretary:* J. Lanjouw, Utrecht; *Administrator of finances:* J. Rousseau, Montréal; *Treasurer:* F. A. Stafleu, Utrecht; *Members:* Ch. Baehni, Genève; A. L. Cabrera, La Plata; C. M. Eardley, Adelaide; F. R. Fosberg, Wasnington; R. E. Fries, Stockholm; H. Humbert, Paris; H. Melchior, Berlin; J. A. Nannfeldt, Uppsala; C. G. G. J. van Steenis, Leiden; W. B. Turrill, Kew.

TAXON

Vol. I nos 1—9, 1951—1952; Vol. II nos 1—8, 1953; Vol. III nos 1—9, 1954; Vol. IV nos 1—9, 1955.

Backnumbers (Vol. I nos. 3 & 4 excepted) are available for all members. Those who joined the I.A.P.T. on or after 1 Jan. 1956 can buy Vol. I (nos. 3 & 4 excepted) against $ 2.— and Vols. II, III, and IV (complete) against $ 3.— per copy. Single numbers are free for all regular members.

CONTENTS

Rollins, R. C. — The second Utrecht conference on Botanical Nomenclature 1
Wit, H. C. D. de — Nomina nuda are not illegitimate 4
Fosberg, F. R. & Sachet, M. H. — The Indo-Pacific Strand Scaevola 7
Heywood, V. H. — The University Herbarium, Liverpool 10
Rothmaler, W. — Taxonomie und Nomenklatur 12
Regnum Vegetabile — New Editions 13
News and Notes
Missouri Botanical Garden Symposium on Systematics (E. Davis) 14
The George R. Cooley Awards in taxonomic botany (R. C. Rollins) 14
Citrullus Schrader (F. R. Fosberg) 15
Scirpus miliaceus L. (S. T. Blake) 15
Mirmau Adanson vs. *Urostachys* Herter (R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink Jr.) 16
Noch einmal *Urostachys* (Herter) 16
Astrochlaena Hallier 17
Personalia 17
Editorial Committee 17
Special Committee on Stabilization 18
Pseudotsuga taxifolia (Poiret) Britton 19
University of Edinburgh: Plant Taxonomy 19
Notices of Books 19
Species Lupinorum 19
I.A.P.T. 20
Contents 20

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.
All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.